DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 003 RC 015 580

AUTHOR Riley, Gary L.
TITLE A National Overview of Staff and Program Characteristics 1984-1985. HEP/CAMP National Evaluation Project. Research Report No. 1.
INSTITUTION California State Univ., Fresno.
SPONS AGENCY California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.; Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 29p.; For related documents, see RC 015 581-583.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Higher Education; *High School Equivalency Programs; *Migrant Adult Education; Migrant Education; *Migrant Programs; *Personnel Data; *Program Administration; Program Descriptions; Program Design; Program Development; Program Evaluation; Secondary Education; Student Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS *College Assistance Migrant Program; *HEP CAMP National Evaluation Project

ABSTRACT

One of four products of the 1984-85 National Evaluation Project to compile baseline data on characteristics and impacts of High School Equivalency Programs (HEP) and College Assistance for Migrants Programs (CAMP), this report presents a brief overview of the goals, basic research design, and summary of the evaluation project products and a detailed account of HEP/CAMP program features that include: program origins and funding histories, organizational and administrative patterns, staff characteristics, participant profiles, and aggregate summaries of program activities and objectives. The report reveals that 15 HEP and 4 CAMP Programs participated in the evaluation which involved the preparation of student mailing lists, staff surveys, document assembly, and completion of the Project Background Questionnaire. About two-thirds of the programs are associated with colleges or universities. The oldest HEP project was first funded in 1966; the newest in 1982. All current program directors are responsible for on-going program development, program operations, staffing, staff development, and program evaluation. Staff members reflect the student populations served in terms of personal backgrounds, ethnic representation, educational background, and experiences as participants in migrant education programs. Over 80% of staff members have earned bachelor's degrees; over 33% hold graduate degrees; and 70% have credentials in teaching, counseling, or educational administration. (NEC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JAN 1996
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gary L. Riley
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED265003

RESEARCH REPORT NO. 1

A National Overview of Staff and Program Characteristics 1984-1985

Gary L. Riley, Ph.D.
Project Director
and
Assistant Dean for Research
Division of Student Affairs
California State University, Fresno
Fresno, CA 93740

CG015580

The HEP/CAMP National Evaluation Project was funded by the U.S. Department of Education in response to a proposal by the National Association of HEP/CAMP Directors. The grant was awarded to the California State Department of Education for implementation under an Interagency Agreement by research personnel at California State University, Fresno and project associates. The findings and conclusions contained in this research report do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the U.S. Department of Education, the California State Department of Education or the California State University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REPORT SECTION	PAGE
PROJECT STAFF AND ASSOCIATES	i
PART ONE: STUDY DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	1
Goals of the Evaluation Project	1
Basic Research Design	2
Summary of Project Products	2
PART TWO: HEP/CAMP PROGRAM FEATURES	4
Program Origins and Developmental Histories	4
Program and Fiscal Administration	5
Indicators of Program Growth	7
PART THREE: STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS	8
PART FOUR: STAFF CHARACTERISTICS	10
Program Staff Demographics	10
Education and Employment Backgrounds	12
Workloads and Personnel Practices	13
PART FIVE: STAFF OPINION SURVEY	15
PART SIX: SPECIFICATION OF PROGRAM OUTCOMES	19
Program Procedures and Outcome Objectives	20

PROJECT STAFF AND ASSOCIATES

Arthur L. Campa, Project Field Representative, received his Ph.D. in the field of Anthropology from the University of Colorado at Boulder. He has supervised and conducted a variety of evaluative research efforts in Colorado and Wyoming, and has taught university courses in cultural and linguistic anthropology and ethnic studies.

Bob N. Cage, Coodinator of Field Data Collection, received his Ph.D. in Educational Research from Iowa State University. He has directed over 20 research projects, has been involved with migrant education for over 14 years, and is the author of a statistics textbook and several scholarly articles and monographs.

Raul Z. Diaz, Research Associate, received an M.A. in Counseling from California State University, Fresno and has served as a counselor and administrator in migrant education programs for nine years in school and community organizations. He is currently the President of the National Association of HEP/CAMP Programs, elected to that position as the Director of the CSUF CAMP Program which he has administered since its inception in 1981.

Gary L. Riley, Project Director, received his Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration and Organization Studies at Stanford University. He has conducted numerous state, regional, and national evaluation and survey research projects and has authored over 50 books, monographs and scholarly articles since 1967. He is currently Assistant Dean for Research, Planning and Evaluation at CSU, Fresno.

Larry L. Rincones, Project Field Representative, received his M.Ed. in Curriculum & Instruction from the University of Texas, Austin. He has both teaching and administrative experience at the University level, with over seven years experience in HEP/CAMP administration.

Andrew J. Rodarte, Research Associate, received his M.A. in education from the College of Notre Dame in Belmont, California. He has a diverse professional background, having served as a teacher and a dean at the high school level, and as a HEP and Upward Bound Program Director at the University level. He is currently a migrant education administrator in an Educational Services District in the Pacific Northwest.

Don Sanders, Project Field Representative, is currently the Director of the HEP Program at the University of Houston. Since 1967, he has taught at the high school and university levels and has conducted several evaluations of innovative programs. Dr. Sanders is the author of several scholarly articles and a recently published book.

PART ONE: STUDY DESIGN AND SURVEY METHODOLOGY

High School Equivalency Programs (HEP) and College Assistance for Migrants Programs (CAMP) have served approximately 45,000 adult migrants and seasonally employed farmworkers since the mid-1960's when the U.S. Congress acknowledged the need for educational programs which would give assistance to an estimated 1.4 million Americans whose migratory employment patterns often serve as barriers to their completion of secondary and post-secondary educational objectives. In 1984 a decision was made by the U.S. Department of Education to fund a national evaluation effort aimed at establishing baseline data on the characteristics and impact of HEP and CAMP programs. This Research Report is one of four products of the National Evaluation Project.

A planning committee of the National Association of HEP and CAMP Program Directors developed the research design in consultation with leading researchers and other program administrators in the field of migrant education. The study was national in scope, calling for the participation of 100% of the HEP and CAMP programs that were funded and operating in FY 1984 and had also served students the previous year. A total of nineteen (19) programs met these criteria: fifteen (15) HEP programs and four (4) CAMP programs in the continental United States and Puerto Rico.

Goals of the National Evaluation Project

The primary purpose of the National Evaluation Project was to compile a representative set of baseline data on HEP and CAMP programs in such as manner as to: document important program features for descriptive and prescriptive purposes; establish accurate measures and data regarding program achievements; ascertain longitudinal (accumulative)

impacts of program participation; and, provide an exemplar evaluation methodology which might be used at local program levels for continued evaluation activities which build upon the project's baseline data.

Basic Research Design

The study utilized survey instrumentation, site interviews, and document analysis techniques to gather needed information. Questionnaires were distributed to all program personnel who were employed at least half-time by participating projects. Extensive information was also gathered at each program site by an assigned field representative. Field representatives (five in all) were selected from among members of the National Association of HEP/CAMP Programs. Documents collected on project sites included program proposals, fiscal records, and project evaluations (i.e., year-end reports).

Information obtained from participating projects was assembled by a Field Data Coordinator. When assembled, completed sets of survey and project background documents were forwarded to the Project Director at California State University, Fresno for analysis. Neither the Project Director nor the Field Data Coordinator were members of the National HEP/CAMP Association. This staffing arrangement helped to insure that experienced program administrators would have involvement in the data collection, but for reasons of objectivity would have limited involvement in the actual data analysis and reporting functions.

Summary of Project Products

Four written products will be prepared and nationally disseminated by November, 1985: Research Report Number 1, "An Overview of Program and Staff Characteristics;" Research Report Number 2, "An Overview of Student Characteristics and Outcomes;" Research Report Number 3, "A

Comprehensive Analysis of HEP/CAMP Program Impact;" and, a Technical Report titled "A Documented Model of HEP/CAMP Program Evaluation."

The purpose of Research Report No. 1 and Research Report No. 2 is to provide program directors and other interested individuals and educational agencies with a descriptive summary of program background data and student survey data, respectively. Each participating project will be provided with a copy of these reports which will also include summaries of data obtained from their respective staffs and students. Individual project information is only available to that director for purposes of comparing one's project to the averages reported in the HEP and CAMP data aggregates. Others receiving copies of the reports will find that their copies contain program averages only.

Research Report Number 3 is a comprehensive presentation of study findings with particular emphasis upon determining program outcomes and the longitudinal (accumulative) effects of having participated in a HEP or a CAMP program. In addition, Report No. 3 examines a variety of correlational associations between program features and student outcomes.

The Technical Report is a fully documented program evaluation model similar to that used in conducting the National Evaluation, but adapted to fit the needs of local program administrators. The model includes a set of instrumentation, statistical procedures, and reporting procedures that are applicable to individual programs.

PART TWO: HEP/CAMP PROGRAM FEATURES

Nineteen programs (15 HEP's and 4 CAMP's) were included in the final study sample selected on the basis of criteria identified in Part One. The study sample included projects from all regions of the continental United States and Puerto Rico. The oldest HEP Program in the sample was first funded in 1966; the newest in 1982. The oldest CAMP Program in the sample was first funded in 1972; the newest in 1982.

Two projects (one HEP and one CAMP) experienced a loss of Federal funding for a period of one year between their initial year of funding and 1984. Both were subsequently re-funded and continue to operate at the time of this evaluation effort.

Approximately two-thirds of the programs included in the study are formally associated with a college or university, while the others are associated with other types of non-profit educational agencies. About half of the programs are totally residential (the program provides the participants with housing). The others are totally "commuter" types or enroll a combination of residential and commuting participants. In most other regards, there is a great deal of similarlity among programs with respect to the way they are organized, administered, and structured.

Information that is presented in table form throughout this report is summarized for HEP programs in one column and for CAMP programs in another. For a complete analysis of variance by program types (i.e., HEP programs and CAMP programs), please refer to Research Report No. 3.

Program Origins and Developmental Histories

Program Directors completed a "Project Background Questionnaire" which included documented (i.e., factual as opposed to impressionistic) data regarding a variety of project features. One set of items dealt

with the origin of the program--who was involved in its initial planning and development, how was the host agency involved, what kinds of local resources were committed to the project initially? Table 1 summarizes the responses to these questions by program type.

TABLE 1
Summary of Involvements in Initial Proposal Developments

		HEP PROGRAMS	CAMP PROGRAMS
		Percentage of Programs	
Who had PRIMARY responsibility for the development of the first proposal?			
	PROJECT DIRECTOR	66%	
	AGENCY ADMINISTRATOR		50%
	AGENCY STAFF	14%	
	EXTERNAL CONSULTANT		25%
	OTHER (Committees)	20%	25%
Was the CURRENT Director involved?	(YES)	40%	25%
Was an ADVISORY COMMITTEE involved?	(YES)	20%	25%
In-kind CASH contributions made?	(YES)	30%	
Other In-Kind contributions made?	(YES)	67%	50%

NOTE: In this and in the remaining tables in this section of the report there are 15 HEP programs represented and 4 CAMP programs. When making comparisons between HEP and CAMP statistics, bear in mind the fact that one HEP program equals about 7% of the sample while one CAMP program is 25% of the sample. Thus, a 7% response for HEP is equivalent to a 25% response for CAMP.

Program and Fiscal Administration

In virtually all of the programs sampled, the Program Director has primary administrative authority over program operations: staffing and staff development, instructional matters, counseling and other support services, residence hall supervision (where applicable), and monitoring routine program expenditures. In policy matters, however, important differences exist between programs as shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Program Policy and Fiscal Authority

	HEP PROGRAMS	CAMP PROGRAMS
	Percentage of Programs	
Who has primary policy-making authority over the Program?		
AGENCY CHIEF EXECUTIVE	13%	
OTHER SENIOR LINE ADMIN	20%	75%
PROJECT DIRECTOR	53%	25%
OTHER (Agency Board)	14%	
Who has primary responsibility for maintaining project fiscal records?		
AGENCY FISCAL ADMIN	53%	50%
SPECIAL PROJECT OFFICER	40%	50%
OTHER	7%	
Who has primary responsibility for program evaluation and reporting?		
PROJECT DIRECTOR	73%	100%
EXTERNAL (3RD PARTY)	13%	
External Advisory Committee (YES) (Functioning Regularly)	27%	50%

Generally, it is the case that HEP and CAMP Directors report to relatively high level positions in their respective institutions and agencies, quite typically at the level of a Dean, a Vice-President, or a Director of Special Projects. In most cases, it is the position to whom the Program Director reports who was identified as making policy level decisions. Therefore, the director is only one step removed from the policy arena and has considerable access to those decisions. In a few instances, however, there is a lack of clear administrative linkage between the Program Director and the host agency which may be associated with differences in effectiveness, student outcomes, program resources,

and impact (see Report No. 3, "Comprehensive Analysis of Findings and Program Impact.")

Indicators of Program Growth

Since 1980, the average number of HEP and CAMP program participants has increased among the programs included in the study sample, with more or less corresponding increases in the average level of funding support. Table 3 illustrates these patterns of change in enrollments and level of funding support.

TABLE 3
Program Enrollments and Levels of Funding Support
1980 to 1984

	HEP PROGRAMS		CAMP PROGRAMS	
	Average Enrollments	Average Budgets	Average Enrollments	Average Budgets
1984-1985	123	318,500	96	184,500
1983-1984	138	300,000	110	279,000
1982-1983	115	245,000	102	208,500
1981-1982	94	234,500	94	209,500
1980-1981	90	257,000	54	212,000

NOTE: Bear in mind that the enrollments and budgets reported in the above table are based upon only those programs that were actually in the National Evaluation Project sample. One must not conclude from the data in Table 3 that the "national" averages are the same for any given year as those reported in the table. Projects that were once funded but are no longer operating, projects that are newly funded, and other factors have an influence upon "national" averages for the years reported.

Costs per student vary systematically by program type (i.e., HEP and CAMP) due in large part to the greater number of staff required to operate a HEP program. The single biggest cost difference between programs is that associated with serving a residential population.

PART THREE: STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Program background information gathered at project sites included a year-by-year tally of program participants, including selected demographic characteristics such as age, sex, and ethnicity. This information is not only of descriptive value, but allows the researchers to compare actual enrollment characteristics with those who completed and returned the student questionnaire. For comparisons of this type, please refer to Research Report No. 2.

Table 4 indicates that there are significant differences between HEP populations and CAMP populations. This is not surprising, given that there are rather significant differences in the expressed goals and purposes of these two programs.

HEP programs tend to serve an older student population (although not much older). HEP's enroll more men than women, which is the exact opposite of CAMP programs whose gender distributions look very much like the national average for all first-time entering college students.

HEP students are ten times more likely to be married at the time they are enrolled in the program than CAMP students. Both serve a predominantly Hispanic (Chicano, Latino) population, but not necessarily to the exclusion of other ethnic groups represented in the American agricultural "migrant stream." Regional differences are quite significant in this regard indicating that the agricultural migrant population is constituted quite differently from one region to another.

About half of the students served by both types of programs are eligible for participation by virtue of "Seasonal Employment" criteria. CAMP programs serve a greater proportion of interstate (between states) migrants than HEP which serves about an equal number of intrastate.

TABLE 4

HEP and CAMP Student Populations, 1980 to 1984

	HEP PROGRAMS	CAMP PROGRAMS
SEX		
MALE	60%	45%
FEMALE	40%	55%
MARITAL STATUS		
MARRIED (when enrolled)	20%	2%
ETHNICITY		
ASIAN AMERICAN	under 1%	under 1%
BLACK	2%	2%
HISPANIC, LATINO	80%	94%
NATIVE AMERICAN	5%	under 1%
WHITE (non-Hispanic)	12%	2%
OTHER	under 1%	under 1%
AGE		
AGE 17 to 20 YEARS	85%	90%
AGE 21 to 25 YEARS	12%	9%
AGE 26 to 30 YEARS	2%	under 1%
OVER 30 YEARS	1%	under 1%
MIGRANT STATUS		
INTERSTATE	28%	40%
INTRASTATE	24%	10%
SEASONALLY EMPLOYED	48%	50%

NOTE: The information contained in Table 4 was obtained from actual program enrollment records for the years 1980-81, 1981-82, 1982-83, and 1983-84. These are students who enrolled in the sampled programs, and should not be interpreted as representing those who actually completed the full term of enrollment or who met their educational objectives.

PART FOUR: STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

Two sources of information were used to compile data contained in this section of the report: summative information about program staff and staffing characteristics as reported by the Project Directors on the "Project Background Questionnaire," and survey information obtained from individual staff members who were employed at least half-time by their respective programs.

A total of 175 HEP and CAMP program staff responded to the survey questionnaire administered by the Field Representatives on site. The staff questionnaire sought to obtain objective information about staff backgrounds, educational achievements, working conditions, specialized skills, and employment histories. In addition, the survey instrument included a number of opinion items which sought information about how staff perceived program needs, strengths, weaknesses, accomplishments, goals, purposes, and outcomes. Opinion data are reported in Part Five, while this section of the report deals only with the background data.

Program Staff Demographics

HEP and CAMP programs differ significantly in the average number of staff members employed by each. HEP programs employ an average of 10.25 positions, while CAMP programs employ an average of 4.75 positions. The difference is accounted for by the number of instructors that HEP programs must employ in order to offer a comprehensive instructional (GED preparation) curriculum. In most other ways, staffing patterns between programs are quite similar. Staff report working an average of 35 hours per week in HEP and 33 hours per week in CAMP. Staff in both types of programs are under contract for about 10.5 months a year on the average. Directors, on the other hand, work an average of 40 hours per week for

12 months out of the year in both types of programs. Virtually all are 100% "Federally salaried," suggesting that in-kind contributions shown in program budgets come in the form of "other costs" rather than personnel.

TABLE 5

HEP and CAMP Program Staff Demographics

	HEP PROGRAMS	YOUR PROGRAM	CAMP PROGRAMS
	Percentages of Staff		
SEX			
MALE	42%		44%
FEMALE	58%		56%
ETHNICITY			
ASIAN AMERICAN	1%		6%
BLACK	4%		0%
HISPANIC, LATINO	54%		66%
NATIVE AMERICAN	4%		0%
WHITE (Non-Hispanic)	35%		28%
OTHER	2%		0%
ELIGIBLE FOR MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAMS AS CHILDREN? (YES)	21%		33%
FAMILY INCOME AS CHILD			
HIGH INCOME	2%		0%
MIDDLE INCOME	33%		22%
VERY MODEST INCOME	34%		39%
LOW INCOME	31%		39%
LANGUAGE BACKGROUND			
FIRST LANGUAGE Spanish	45%		39%
FIRST LANGUAGE English	51%		56%
FIRST LANGUAGE Other	4%		6%
SECOND LANGUAGE None	36%		44%
SECOND LANGUAGE Spanish	22%		6%
SECOND LANGUAGE English	40%		50%
SECOND LANGUAGE Other	2%		0%

Education and Employment Backgrounds

Compared to the national averages among adults with similar socio-economic and family backgrounds, HEP and CAMP program personnel clearly fall into the higher achievement percentiles for educational attainment and employment status. In this regard, staff provide important role models for program participants by virtue of their high levels of educational accomplishment, special credentials, and professional activities; see Table 6 below.

TABLE 6

Staff Educational and Employment Profiles

	HEP PROGRAMS	YOUR PROGRAM	CAMP PROGRAMS
	Percentages of Staff		
LEVEL OF EDUCATION COMPLETED			
HIGH SCHOOL (or Equivalent)	2%		6%
SOME COLLEGE	16%		6%
FOUR-YEAR DEGREE	21%		17%
SOME GRADUATE STUDY	33%		22%
MASTER'S DEGREE	24%		50%
DOCTORATE	4%		
SPECIAL CREDENTIALS			
TEACHING CREDENTIAL	35%		28%
COUNSELING CREDENTIAL	8%		6%
ADMINISTRATIVE CREDENTIAL	3%		
MORE THAN ONE, ABOVE	10%		21%
OTHER PROF CREDENTIAL	13%		6%
NONE	31%		39%
PRIOR EMPLOYMENT			
IN MIGRANT EDUCATION	37%		17%
TIME IN CURRENT POSITION			
IN MONTHS (MEAN AVERAGE)	28		27

Workloads and Personnel Practices

Almost without exception, HEP and CAMP Program Directors work under twelve (12) month, full-time contracts. Staff, however, work an average of 10.5 months in HEP programs and 10.25 months in CAMP. In both types of programs, staff average about 35 hours per week (mean average hours for full-time and part-time staff).

All of the HEP and CAMP Program Directors reported that they hire students as assistants on an hourly basis: tutors, advisors, residence assistants, and combinations of all these. Half of the HEP programs and all of the CAMP programs reported making a special effort to hire former students, when appropriate.

Approximately one-third of the sample programs reported that staff are recruited through statewide or regional search efforts. Others do local, regional, and even national searches as necessary and depending upon the nature of the position. HEP Directors report a 12% average staff turnover rate from year to year; CAMP Directors report an average turnover rate of 5% annually.

Twenty percent (20%) of the HEP programs indicated that staff have tenure rights. One HEP program reported that all staff are tenured. In the CAMP sample, only one project reported having any staff covered by tenure or retreat priviledges. For the most part, "permanent staff" are those who were employed by the host agency or institution prior to the beginning of the project. Ten percent of all HEP staff members were formerly employed by the host agency, while nearly a fourth of all CAMP employees came from former institutional positions. If their programs were to be terminated, these individuals would return to their former assignments as a condition of permanence.

TABLE 7

Staff Work Loads and Professional Development

	HEP PROGRAMS	YOUR PROGRAM	CAMP PROGRAMS
	Percentage of Staff		
OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT			
Staff reporting that they have other part-time work IN the host agency:	12%		11%
Staff reporting that they have other part-time work OUTSIDE of the host agency:	13%		17%
ANNUAL CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE			
ATTEND NONE	27%		22%
ATTEND ONE OR TWO	53%		67%
ATTEND THREE OR FOUR	14%		11%
ATTEND FIVE OR MORE	6%		0%
STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES			
NUMBER PER YEAR (average)	5.13		6.44
DIRECT STUDENT CONTACTS			
NUMBER PER DAY (average)	22.5		13.0
HOURS PER DAY (average)	4.95		4.55

To the extent that staff workload patterns can be generalized, it appears that the primary difference between HEP and CAMP workloads is in the instructional area. HEP programs employ a larger number of staff per participant, and this difference is largely due to the instructional requirements growing out of the GED basic skill curriculum. Classroom contact loads raise the mean staff average for HEP programs, while the student contact load among counseling and advising staff of both types of programs are virtually identical.

PART FIVE: STAFF OPINION SURVEY

Questionnaires were administered to all program personnel who were employed at least half-time by their respective projects. Local site administrations of these instruments produced a 100% response rate in all but a very few instances.

Staff opinions were sought regarding a variety of program features and student outcomes. In Research Report Number 3, staff opinion data are compared to other indicators of the same program features and student outcomes. In this current report, however, no attempt is made to validate or verify staff perceptions by means of other measures.

TABLE 8

Staff Opinion Survey Results

KEY

SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree
NO = No Opinion/Prefer Not To Answer

	PROGRAM	SA	A	D	SD	NO
PERCENTAGE RESPONDING THAT THE PROGRAM ACTUALLY EMPHASIZES:						
1. Scholarly Achievement	HEP	31%	62%	5%	1%	1%
	CAMP	44%	56%	0%	0%	0%
2. Analytical Skills	HEP	23%	63%	8%	1%	5%
	CAMP	11%	78%	6%	0%	6%
3. Social Skills	HEP	35%	55%	5%	0%	5%
	CAMP	39%	61%	0%	0%	0%
4. Cultural Identity	HEP	29%	52%	10%	3%	6%
	CAMP	44%	44%	12%	0%	0%
5. Self-Esteem	HEP	61%	33%	3%	0%	3%
	CAMP	78%	22%	0%	0%	0%
6. Creative Qualities	HEP	16%	59%	14%	3%	8%
	CAMP	40%	44%	6%	0%	10%

CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

TABLE 8 (CONTINUED)

KEY

SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree
NO = No Opinion/Prefer Not To Answer

	PROGRAM	SA	A	D	SD	NO
PERCENTAGE RESPONDING THAT THE PROGRAM ACTUALLY EMPHASIZES:						
7. Career Related Skills	HEP	35%	56%	5%	0%	4%
	CAMP	50%	28%	16%	0%	6%
8. Practical, Applied Skills	HEP	32%	59%	3%	1%	5%
	CAMP	44%	56%	0%	0%	0%
PERCENTAGE RESPONDING THAT THE PROGRAM OUGHT TO EMPHASIZE:						
9. Instructional Outcomes	HEP	24%	51%	17%	0%	8%
	CAMP	22%	50%	28%	0%	0%
10. Personal Development	HEP	36%	42%	12%	1%	9%
	CAMP	67%	28%	6%	0%	0%
11. Job Related Skills	HEP	25%	50%	15%	0%	10%
	CAMP	17%	56%	28%	0%	0%
OVERALL PROGRAM CONDITIONS:						
12. Program enjoys high administrative support	HEP	35%	38%	11%	3%	13%
	CAMP	39%	39%	17%	6%	0%
13. High staff morale	HEP	37%	39%	11%	3%	9%
	CAMP	61%	39%	0%	0%	0%
14. Program lacks adequate (sufficient) resources	HEP	11%	30%	43%	10%	6%
	CAMP	6%	44%	50%	0%	0%
15. More staff development activity is needed	HEP	18%	48%	22%	1%	11%
	CAMP	17%	50%	28%	0%	6%
16. Federal regulations may often interfere	HEP	14%	34%	28%	3%	22%
	CAMP	11%	17%	50%	0%	22%
17. Agency/institutional policies conflict with program needs	HEP	4%	13%	49%	11%	24%
	CAMP	0%	17%	39%	17%	28%

CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

TABLE 8 (CONTINUED)

KEY

SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree
NO = No Opinion/Prefer Not To Answer

		PROGRAM	SA	A	D	SD	NO
18.	Program stresses procedures over outcomes	HEP	8%	19%	44%	19%	10%
		CAMP	6%	17%	56%	22%	0%
19.	Outside agencies help the program a lot	HEP	6%	31%	31%	14%	18%
		CAMP	11%	17%	44%	22%	6%
20.	Program should form stronger linkages with other Migrant programs	HEP	28%	46%	10%	1%	14%
		CAMP	22%	55%	11%	6%	6%
21.	Staff need more feedback on effectiveness	HEP	15%	53%	20%	4%	8%
		CAMP	11%	33%	50%	6%	0%
22.	Staff need more feedback on own performance	HEP	22%	43%	20%	3%	12%
		CAMP	17%	50%	28%	0%	6%
STAFF ROLE AND COMMITMENT:							
23.	(I) participate a great deal in decision-making	HEP	27%	48%	14%	3%	8%
		CAMP	56%	17%	22%	0%	6%
24.	(I) am personally committed to project goals	HEP	79%	20%	0%	0%	1%
		CAMP	94%	6%	0%	0%	0%
25.	(I) am very satisfied with my current job	HEP	35%	35%	26%	3%	1%
		CAMP	39%	33%	28%	0%	0%
26.	This job will improve my career opportunities	HEP	31%	43%	12%	3%	11%
		CAMP	28%	39%	22%	0%	11%
PROGRAM OUTCOMES:							
27.	Overall, the program clearly benefits the majority of students	HEP	68%	29%	3%	0%	1%
		CAMP	72%	22%	6%	0%	0%
28.	(I) see very positive changes in all students	HEP	50%	44%	3%	0%	4%
		CAMP	50%	28%	6%	0%	17%

The information that is contained in Table 8 offers an excellent opportunity to discuss an important feature of statistical methodology. "Scores" on each item represent combined staff ratings across all HEP programs and CAMP programs, respectively. From the information that is in the table, one cannot determine whether staff ratings systematically vary from one program to another. Nor is it possible to determine how much variance exists between staff within a given program. Although it is useful to make comparisons of the type presented in Table 8, there are significant differences in staff ratings between programs and, in some cases, within a given project. These differences are explored in detail in Research Report No. 3 where analytical comparisons are made for purposes of identifying program features that are associated with varying degrees of success in reaching stated outcomes.

Given these limitations, the information contained in Table 8 does suggest that HEP and CAMP program staff members share a number of common (positive) perceptions regarding program characteristics, professional climate, and student outcomes. Taken as a whole, HEP and CAMP staff are largely supportive of their programs, confident in their abilities to achieve important outcomes, and optimistic in their trust of external (i.e., institutional, administrative, Federal) influences to support their programs and mission.

Those familiar with research on complex, professionalized organizations will recognize several important differences between HEP and CAMP programs, however, which are probably attributable to differences in program status. HEP program staff generally gave lower ratings to the level of staff morale, the amount of staff participation in central decision-making, and optimism regarding outside influence.

PART SIX: SPECIFICATION OF PROGRAM OUTCOMES

HEP and CAMP programs are funded on an annual basis as determined by a competitive review process which rests entirely upon information that is contained in a written proposal (program plan). Programs submitting successful proposals are awarded one-year grants with which to carry out the activities specified in the proposal narrative. For all practical purposes, the proposal document serves as the basis of a contractual agreement between the grantee (Program) and the U.S. Department of Education.

Contractual relationships of all types bind one party to another in some form of a performance agreement. HEP and CAMP programs are bound to the U.S. Department of Education as service providers to designated populations. From an evaluation standpoint, it is not sufficient to simply demonstrate that a service was provided. It is implied that the service provider will achieve some acceptible level of <u>outcome</u> success, as well.

If a program proposal (program plan of operation) only includes descriptions of activities and lists of services to be provided, any effort to evaluate is limited to an assessment of the extent to which <u>procedural</u> objectives have been met. [Were students enrolled? Did the program provide career counseling? Were classes offered in GED basic skill preparation? Was the program evaluated?]

Without procedures, of course, managers could not manage and staff would not have guidelines for providing services. Yet, without clearly stated <u>outcome</u> objectives, there is no way to determine <u>effectiveness</u>. [Did students remain enrolled through the completion of their first year in college? How many students actually developed a written career plan?

How many students mastered basic skills in reading, writing, math, and so forth? What impact did this program have upon remedying the needs and problems which the grant funds are obliged by law to address?]

Program Procedures and Outcome Objectives

Field Representatives gathered sets of program documents at each project site: proposals, plans of operation, and performance reports. Project staff at CSU, Fresno performed content analyses of these documents, looking specifically for information that was formatted in such a way as to be identifiable as a procedure or as an outcome objective.

In all, 37 areas of performance activity were identified, classified, and coded on a project-by-project basis. Table 9, following, lists all the performance activities in five categories: Management Activities; Developmental Activities; Student Support Activities; Education/Instructional Activities; and Career Development.

Program documents were scanned to determine which of the 37 performance activities each project had actually specified. If specified, the performance activity was coded as being either "Procedurally Defined" or "Outcome Specific." Table 9 summarizes the results of this analysis.

TABLE 9

Analysis of Program Performance Activities

	PROGRAM TYPE	PROCEDURE STATEMENT	OUTCOME DEFINED	NOT STATED
MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES				
1. Publicize Program	HEP	12%	0%	88%
	CAMP	0%	0%	100%
2. Student Outreach	HEP	63%	31%	6%
	CAMP	25%	75%	0%
3. General Orientation	HEP	13%	6%	81%
	CAMP	75%	0%	25%

CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

TABLE 9
C O N T I N U E D
Analysis of Program Performance Activities

	PROGRAM TYPE	PROCEDURE STATEMENT	OUTCOME DEFINED	NOT STATED
MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES (C O N T I N U E D)				
4. Staffing/Supervision	HEP	38%	6%	56%
	CAMP	25%	25%	50%
5. Fiscal Administration	HEP	13%	6%	81%
	CAMP	0%	0%	100%
6. Program Evaluation	HEP	38%	19%	44%
	CAMP	50%	25%	25%
7. Student Evaluation	HEP	25%	6%	69%
	CAMP	25%	0%	75%
8. Student Retention	HEP	13%	6%	81%
	CAMP	50%	0%	50%
9. External Linkages	HEP	19%	19%	62%
	CAMP	25%	0%	75%
DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES				
10. Staff Development	HEP	31%	0%	69%
	CAMP	25%	25%	50%
11. Curriculum Development	HEP	6%	6%	88%
	CAMP	25%	0%	75%
12. Funding Development	HEP	0%	0%	100%
	CAMP	0%	0%	100%
13. Services Development	HEP	0%	0%	100%
	CAMP	0%	0%	100%
14. Job Development & Placement	HEP	0%	0%	100%
	CAMP	0%	0%	100%

C O N T I N U E D N E X T P A G E

TABLE 9
C O N T I N U E D
Analysis of Program Performance Activities

	PROGRAM TYPE	PROCEDURE STATEMENT	OUTCOME DEFINED	NOT STATED
STUDENT SUPPORT ACTIVITIES				
15. Health Services	HEP	56%	6%	38%
	CAMP	0%	25%	75%
16. Academic Support	HEP	56%	0%	44%
	CAMP	0%	0%	100%
17. Job Placement	HEP	44%	6%	50%
	CAMP	25%	0%	75%
18. Personal Counseling	HEP	62%	19%	19%
	CAMP	25%	25%	50%
19. Academic Counseling	HEP	44%	6%	50%
	CAMP	25%	25%	50%
20. Career Counseling	HEP	56%	6%	38%
	CAMP	75%	0%	25%
21. Financial Counseling	HEP	0%	0%	100%
	CAMP	25%	0%	75%
22. Direct Financial Aid	HEP	19%	6%	75%
	CAMP	25%	25%	50%
23. Residential Services	HEP	50%	12%	38%
	CAMP	0%	25%	75%
24. Recreational Services	HEP	44%	0%	56%
	CAMP	0%	25%	75%
25. Cultural Support	HEP	38%	6%	56%
	CAMP	50%	25%	25%
EDUCATIONAL/INSTRUCTION				
26. Tutorial Assistance	HEP	31%	6%	63%
	CAMP	75%	25%	0%
27. Math Development	HEP	25%	12%	63%
	CAMP	25%	0%	75%
28. Reading Development	HEP	50%	12%	38%
	CAMP	25%	0%	75%

C O N T I N U E D N E X T P A G E

TABLE 9
C O N T I N U E D
Analysis of Program Performance Activities

	PROGRAM TYPE	PROCEDURE STATEMENT	OUTCOME DEFINED	NOT STATED
EDUCATIONAL/INSTRUCTION				
29. Writing Development	HEP	50%	12%	38%
	CAMP	25%	25%	50%
30. Study/Learning Skills	HEP	12%	0%	88%
	CAMP	50%	25%	25%
31. Educational Advancement	HEP	69%	25%	6%
	CAMP	50%	0%	50%
CAREER DEVELOPMENT				
32. Career Awareness	HEP	63%	6%	31%
	CAMP	50%	25%	25%
33. Self-Assessment	HEP	37%	0%	63%
	CAMP	25%	0%	75%
34. Occupational (Skill) Development	HEP	38%	6%	56%
	CAMP	75%	0%	25%
35. Cooperative Education (Supervised Work Exper)	HEP	37%	0%	63%
	CAMP	0%	0%	100%
36. Career Planning	HEP	50%	0%	50%
	CAMP	50%	0%	50%
37. Career Placement	HEP	69%	6%	25%
	CAMP	50%	0%	50%

NOTE: A total of 27 areas of performance activity were identified from various sources of project documentation. Although these categories are as mutually exclusive as possible, a certain degree of overlap may exist between two related items. No single program is designed to address all 27 of these categories. Caution must be exercised when quoting data in this table "out of context."

Overall, programs are most thoroughly documented in terms of their specification of outcome objectives in the areas of Program Management and Student Supportive Services. In these categories, up to 75% of the sampled programs address specific outcomes or procedural objectives.

Least well documented are Developmental Activities which include activities such as developing alternative funding sources, student services development, and the development of career placements for program graduates. One should not conclude from these data that HEP and CAMP programs are not engaged in developmental activities. This information is merely indicative of the fact that programs do not generally specify outcome or procedural objectives associated with these activities. Nor are these activities documented in program performance reports, periodic evaluation reports, or other program-initiated documentation.

In no category of performance activity did more than 25% of the programs in the study sample specify outcome objectives. Certain kinds of activities, of course, do not lend themselves well to "behaviorally defined outcomes." Nevertheless, virtually all program procedures can be linked to an expression of anticipated outcome: a product, a skill level, an enrollment quota, a completion rate.

Research Report No. 3 addresses several important evaluation questions that are associated with the specification of performance outcomes and the extent to which such outcomes are actually achieved. Although it is not necessarily the case that a program only achieves the outcomes that it specifies in its proposal, the odds that an objective will be reached increase significantly if that objectives was initially specified. In Research Report No. 3, statements of anticipated outcomes are compared to actual outcomes, and comparisons are made between programs that specified outcomes to the accomplishments of those which did not. To the extent that what is <u>intended</u> is also that which is most likely to be <u>achieved</u>, increased attention should be given to the specification of anticipated outcomes and procedural objectives in project proposals.